

---

***IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE***

---

In re application of: Henkin et al.

Attorney Docket No.: KABAP003

Application No.: 09/943,571

Examiner: Boveja, Namrata

Filed: August 29, 2001

Group: 3622

Title: DYNAMIC DOCUMENT CONTEXT  
MARK-UP TECHNIQUE IMPLEMENTED  
OVER A COMPUTER NETWORK

---

CERTIFICATE OF EFS-WEB TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically through EFS-WEB to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 9, 2008.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ /Dean Wolf/  
Dean Wolf

**TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

During a telephonic interview between the undersigned attorney and Group Art Unit Supervisory Examiner Eric Stamber on 10/30/2008, Applicant's representative inquired whether it was necessary to submit a Terminal Disclaimer in the instant application in view of the allowed claims identified in the Notice of Allowance (mailed 09-29-2008) relating to commonly-owned US App. Ser. No. 10/977,352. The Examiner indicated that it was NOT necessary to submit such a Terminal Disclaimer as the allowed claims in as the allowed claims in US App. Ser. No. 09/943,571 and US App. Ser. No. 10/977,352 are patentably distinct. A copy of the Examiner's Interview Summary is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,  
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Dean E. Wolf/

Dean E. Wolf  
Reg. No. 37,260

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(510) 663-1100

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/943,571	HENKIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Eric W. Stamber	3622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eric W. Stamber (SPE, Art Unit 3622) (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Dean Wolf (Applicants representative) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 30 October 2008

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: none.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wolf called inquiring whether it was a necessary to submit a Terminal Disclaimer in the instant application in view of related app. 10/977,352. The decision was made that it was NOT necessary to submit the Terminal Disclaimer as the claims in the two applications are patentably distinct.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Eric W. Stamber/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3622
--	---